



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1856
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	18 Landrock Road, Hornsey, London, N8 9HL
Proposal:	Erection of a side infill extension at the side return at the rear of the building, alteration to the rear opening at ground floor. Alteration to two existing windows at ground and first floor on side of rear return. Construction of a new lightwell at the front under the existing bay window; alteration to the front garden wall; erection of a new timber bin and bike store with green roof along front garden wall.
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	13/07/2023
Applicant:	Mr Benjamin Marinic
Agent:	mr bernard tulken

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE AND SURROUNDING

The application site is a two-storey terrace property located on the northern side Landrock Road and lies within the Crouch End Conservation Area. The conservation area has a cohesive character deriving partly from its development by a relatively limited number of builders and architects.

Nos. 12 to 36 Landrock Road is a symmetrical terrace of similar character to the houses on the east side of Bourne Road, but better preserved. The two end houses and the central three houses each have full width black and white half-timbered gables. The houses retain much of their original details, including some front doors and coloured glazing, and the terrace remains a good local example of late-Victorian domestic

architecture. Accordingly, the terrace including No. 18, is considered to positively contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application is for the following works:

- Erection of a side infill extension at the side return at the rear of the building;
- Alteration to the rear opening at ground floor;
- Alteration to two existing windows at ground and first floor on side of rear return;
- Construction of a new lightwell at the front under the existing bay window;
- Alteration to the front garden wall; &
- Erection of a new timber bin and bike store with green roof along front garden wall.

3. SITE HISTORY

The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision. Neighbouring properties have received permission for extensions, alterations, and residential conversions.

4. CONSULTATION

LBH Conservation –Works are generally acceptable, the new boundary treatment may cause harm on the conservation area.

Officer comments: The boundary treatment is on balance considered acceptable and would consist of a dwarf-wall with small strip of timber fencing above serving to screen bins. The design here would be consistent with No 24 and in making a decision on this application, it is noted that a boundary wall to the height of 1m can be erected without the need for planning consent.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by the way of letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

Objections: 2

Support: 0

Objections summarised:

1. Light reduced into property No 16.
2. Restricts oblique views of the garden No 16.
3. Party wall considerations.

Officers comments: Party wall considerations are a civil matter.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
2. Basement development;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches.

High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

Infill/ rear extension

The rear addition is a proportionate subservient addition, creating a full width rear return to create additional dining/living area. The simple design and layout will utilise the full width and will not project out beyond the existing footprint regarding the rear of the building.

Due to its modest footprint and height, the proposed extension would not dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling and would have limited visibility over and above the height of the boundary fence to the adjoining property. Rear / infill extensions of this nature are common to properties in the immediate area.

Front lightwell

Policy DM18 states that the Council will only support light wells where they do not result in the loss of more than 50% of the front garden or amenity area and do not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The proposed lightwell would be located to the front of the building and would not be highly visible from public vantage points. Excavation would be limited to add a small window below ground level covered up by a metal grate.

The visible manifestation of the house as seen from the street would remain largely the same with the current front boundary wall and absence of railing around the lightwell making the lightwell barely noticeable. It should be mentioned there are other examples of front lightwells within the same terrace namely at No. 24 where, an almost identical design has been adopted. This is only one example however, there are more within the local context and therefore the principle is established.

Boundary treatment

The boundary treatment on the road frontage would comprise of a brick dwarf wall with a section of timber fence above. This would resemble the boundary treatment at No. 24. This would serve to screen bin and bike storage with a "green roof" which we welcome with the condition that the brick match the host dwelling. As noted above in making a decision on this application, it is noted that a boundary wall to the height of 1m can be erected without the need for planning consent.

Overall the extension and alterations here are considered acceptable in design and heritage terms, being subservient to the original house and having minimal impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, as such leaving it preserved. In reaching this decision considerable importance and weight has been given to preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area, in line with the statutory test.

Basement Works

DPD policy DM18 ('Residential Basement Development and Light Wells') requires householder extensions for basement development to demonstrate that a proposal will not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building and neighbouring buildings; does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties; avoids harm to the established character of the surrounding area and not to adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties or the local natural and historic environment.

The property here already benefits from a basement floor and no excavation/ lowering to this floor is proposed. As reflected above the works are limited to adding a front lightwell, which would be minor in nature requiring minimal amounts of excavation and engineering. Such works would not compromise the structural integrity of the existing dwelling and the neighbouring properties because of the very limited scale of works and therefore, adheres to policy DM18.

The site is within a Critical Drainage Area as defined in Policy DM26, which requires that all proposals for new development within a CDA to incorporate measures to reduce the overall level of flood risk, and dependent on the nature and scale of the development to provide a Flood Risk Assessment. The development here is not however “new development” but rather a lightwell addition to an existing house. The works here minor front lightwell. As such as there is only a very modest increase in the proportion of hard surfacing on site, meaning surface water discharged to the ground will not be adversely affected.

Amenity Comments

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

DPD Policy DM1 ‘Delivering High Quality Design’ states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development’s users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

The lightwell would not have any affect on amenity given its location and subterranean position. It is noted that concerns are raised about the infill side extension. The rear extension is of a height (2.8m approximately) and depth (5.5m approximately) that, as noted above, is considered proportionate and subordinate in scale.

The height and depth of this extension will not affect the amenity to No 16, as the wall to the extension on the boundary is kept low. There is a current boundary fence and vegetation on the shared boundary with No 16. The height of the extension over and above the fence/ vegetation line is not significant, and as such will not adversely affect neighbouring amenity in terms of conditions of light, outlook or have an overbearing/ tunnelling effect.

Given the differences in ground level between the extension and the ground floor to main part of the house to No 16, the height of the extension on the boundary is not significant and as such not harmful to amenity, i.e. in terms of conditions of light and outlook. It is also noted that light and outlook to the inner rear window and side windows to No 16 are already restricted by the current backdrop of the existing two-storey outrigger to the application property.

Overall, the works here are considered acceptable in amenity terms.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions and alterations are considered acceptable in design, heritage and amenity terms. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.